

CHAPTER 6

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN THE CANEY FORK RIVER WATERSHED

- 6.1. Background**
- 6.2. Comments from Public Meetings**
 - 6.2.A. Year 1 Public Meeting**
 - 6.2.B. Year 3 Public Meeting**
 - 6.2.C. Special Meeting Held at Citizen's Request**
 - 6.2.D. Year 5 Public Meeting**
- 6.3. Approaches Used**
 - 6.3.A. Point Sources**
 - 6.3.B. Nonpoint Sources**

6.1. BACKGROUND.

The Watershed Water Quality Management Plan serves as a comprehensive inventory of resources and stressors in the watershed, a recommendation for control measures, and a guide for planning activities in the next five-year watershed cycle and beyond. Water quality improvement will be a result of implementing both regulatory and nonregulatory programs.

In addition to the NPDES program, some state and federal regulations, such as the TMDL and ARAP programs, address point and nonpoint issues. Construction and MS4 stormwater rules (implemented under the NPDES program) are transitioning from Phase 1 to Phase 2. More information on stormwater rules may be found at: <http://www.state.tn.us/environment/wpc/stormh2o/MS4.htm>.

This Chapter addresses point and nonpoint source approaches to water quality problems in the Caney Fork River Watershed.

6.2. COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC MEETINGS. Watershed meetings are open to the public, and most meetings were represented by citizens who live in the watershed, NPDES permittees, business people, farmers, and local river conservation interests. Locations for meetings were frequently chosen after consulting with people who live and work in the watershed. Everyone with an interest in clean water is encouraged to be a part of the public meeting process. The times and locations of watershed meetings are posted at: <http://www.state.tn.us/environment/wpc/public.htm>.

6.2.A. Year 1 Public Meeting. The first Caney Fork River Watershed public meeting was held April 17, 1997 in Smithville. The goals of the meeting were to 1)present, and review the objectives of, the Watershed Approach, 2)introduce local, state, and federal agency and nongovernment organization partners, 3)review water quality monitoring strategies, and 4)solicit input from the public.

Major Concerns/Comments

- ◆ Wasteload allocations and their use in running models
- ◆ Lake management
- ◆ Communication with citizen groups
- ◆ The effect of naming the Caney Fork River an Outstanding National Resource Water (ONRW)
- ◆ Fish postings

6.2.B. Year 3 Public Meeting. The second Caney Fork River Watershed public meeting was held July 13, 1999 at the Smithville Courthouse. The goals of the meeting were to 1)provide an overview of the watershed approach, 2)review the monitoring strategy, 3)summarize the most recent water quality assessment, 4)discuss the TMDL schedule and citizens' role in commenting on draft TMDLs, and 5)discuss BMPs and other nonpoint source tools available through the Tennessee Department of Agriculture 319 Program and NRCS conservation assistance programs.

Major Concerns/Comments

- ◆ Cows in the creek adding to Nonpoint source pollution
- ◆ Increased discharges to 303(d)-listed streams from a planned industrial development
- ◆ Development by the City of Cookeville around Mine Lick Creek
- ◆ Inadequate protection of sinkholes

6.2.C. Special Meeting Held at Citizens' Request. An additional meeting was held on August 26, 1999 at Putnam County Library (Cookeville) at the request of the Upper Cumberland Sierra Club and Save our Cumberland Mountains (SOCM).

Major Concerns/Comments

- ◆ Concern About Tennessee's nonpoint program located in Department of Agriculture
- ◆ Lack of knowledge of 319 program by Tennessee landowners
- ◆ Lack of monitoring of springs
- ◆ 303(d) List and 305(b) Report should be on TDEC web site

6.2.D. Year 5 Public Meeting. The third scheduled Caney Fork River Watershed public meeting was held October 14, 2003 at the Sparta Civic Center in cooperation with the Cumberland River Compact. The meeting featured six educational components:

- Overview of draft Watershed Water Quality Management Plan slide show
- Benthic macroinvertebrate samples and interpretation
- SmartBoard™ with interactive GIS maps
- "How We Monitor Streams" self-guided slide show
- "Why We Do Biological Sampling" self-guided slide show
- Citizen Group Display (Cumberland River Compact)
- University display (Tennessee Technological University)

In addition, citizens had the opportunity to make formal comments on the draft Watershed Water Quality Management Plan and to rate the effectiveness of the meeting.




Figure 6-1. Attendance at Public Meetings in the Caney Fork River Watershed. The 1997 and 1999 watershed meeting numbers represent Caney Fork River and Collins River Watersheds joint meetings. The 2003 Caney Fork River Watershed meeting was held in cooperation with the Cumberland River Compact.



Figure 6-2. Environmental Specialist Jimmy Smith helps students learn about the relationship between aquatic insects and water quality at the Caney Fork River Watershed public meeting (photo courtesy of Karen Smith/Cumberland River Compact).




Figure 6-3. The SmartBoard™ is an effective interactive tool to teach citizens about the power of GIS (photo courtesy of Karen Smith/Cumberland River Compact).



Figure 6-4. Watershed meetings are an effective way to communicate Water Pollution Control's activities to elected officials, like Mayor Womack of Cookeville and White County Executive Sullivan (photo courtesy of Karen Smith/Cumberland River Compact).

6.3. APPROACHES USED.

6.3.A. Point Sources. Point source contributions to stream impairment are primarily addressed by NPDES and ARAP permit requirements and compliance with the terms of the permits. Notices of NPDES and ARAP draft permits available for public comment can be viewed at <http://www.state.tn.us/environment/wpc/wpcppo/>. Discharge monitoring data submitted by NPDES-permitted facilities may be viewed at http://www.epa.gov/enviro/html/pes/pes_query_java.html.

The purpose of the TMDL program is to identify remaining sources of pollution and allocate pollution control needs in places where water quality goals are still not being achieved. TMDL studies are tools that allow for a better understanding of load reductions necessary for impaired streams to return to compliance with water quality standards. More information about Tennessee's TMDL program may be found at: <http://www.state.tn.us/environment/wpc/tmdl.php>

TMDLs are prioritized for development based on many factors.




Figure 6-5. Prioritization scheme for TMDL Development.

6.3.B. Nonpoint Sources

Common nonpoint sources of pollution include urban runoff, riparian vegetation removal, and inappropriate land development, agricultural, and road construction practices. Since nonpoint pollution exists essentially everywhere rain falls and drains to a stream, existing point source regulations can have only a limited effect, so other measures are necessary.

There are several state and federal regulations that address some of the contaminants impacting waters in the Caney Fork River Watershed. Some of these are limited to only point sources: a pipe or ditch. Often, controls of point sources are not sufficient to protect waters, so other measures are necessary. Some measures include voluntary efforts by landowners and volunteer groups, while others may involve new regulations. Many agencies, including the Tennessee Department of Agriculture and NRCS, offer financial assistance to landowners for corrective actions (like Best Management Practices) that may be sufficient for recovery of impacted streams. Many nonpoint problems will require an active civic involvement at the local level geared towards establishment of improved zoning guidelines, building codes, streamside buffer zones and greenways, and general landowner education.

The following text describes certain types of impairments, causes, suggested improvement measures, and control strategies. The suggested measures and streams are only examples and efforts should not be limited to only those streams and measures mentioned.

6.3.B.i. Sedimentation.

6.3.B.i.a. From Construction Sites. Construction activities have historically been considered “nonpoint sources.” In the late 1980’s, EPA designated them as being subject to NPDES regulation if more than 5 acres are disturbed. In the spring of 2003, that threshold became 1 acre. The general permit issued for such construction sites sets out conditions for maintenance of the sites to minimize pollution from stormwater runoff, including requirements for installation and inspection of erosion controls. Also, the general permit imposes more stringent inspection and self-monitoring requirements on sites in the watershed of streams that are already impaired due to sedimentation. Examples in the Caney Fork River Watershed include the Rocky River and Hudgens Creek. Regardless of the size, no construction site is allowed to cause a condition of pollution.

Construction sites within a sediment-impaired watershed may also have higher priority for inspections by WPC personnel, and are likely to have enforcement actions for failure to control erosion. Historically, construction activities have not been a large source of the sediment problems within the Caney Fork River Watershed, due to its sparsely populated nature. However, in recent years, there has been an increase in both population and construction activities in the area.

6.3.B.i.b. From Channel and/or Bank Erosion. Many streams within the Caney Fork Watershed suffer from varying degrees of streambank erosion. When stream channels are altered, or large tracts of land are cleared, leading to increased stream runoff, banks can become unstable and highly erodable. Heavy livestock traffic can also severely disturb banks. Destabilized banks contribute sediment load and lose riparian vegetation. This cycle is especially problematic in certain areas of the Caney Fork River Watershed where the very sandy plateau soils and shallow rooted trees are especially vulnerable. Most of the land and channel alterations center around agricultural practices or mining operations.

Several agencies such as the NRCS and TDA, as well as watershed citizen groups, are working to stabilize portions of stream banks using bioengineering and other techniques. Many of the affected streams, like Smith Fork, could benefit from these types of projects. Other methods or controls that might be necessary to address common problems are:

Voluntary activities

- Re-establishment of bank vegetation (examples: Reestablishment of bank vegetation (examples: Post Oak Creek, and upper portions of Falling Water River).
- Establish buffer zones along streams running through crop fields or nurseries (example: Bee Creek).
- Establish off channel watering areas for cattle by moving watering troughs and feeders back from stream banks (examples: Blue Springs Branch and Snow Creek).
- Limit cattle access to streams and bank vegetation (examples: Beaverdam and Little Beaverdam Creeks).

Additional strategies

- Better community planning for the impacts of development on small streams, especially development in growing areas (example: small streams in and around Cookeville, Smithville, and Sparta).
- Restrictions requiring post construction run-off rates to be no greater than pre-construction rates in order to avoid in-channel erosion, (example: Hudgens Creek).
- Additional restrictions on logging in streamside management zones.
- Prohibition on clearing of stream and ditch banks (example: Hickman Creek).
Note: Permits may be required for work along streams.
- Additional restriction to road and utilities crossings of streams.
- Restrictions on the use of off-highway vehicles on stream banks and in stream channels.

6.3.B.i.c. From Agriculture and Silviculture. Even though there is an exemption in the Water Quality Control Act which states that normal agricultural and silvicultural practices which do not result in a point source discharge do not have to obtain a permit, efforts are being made to address impacts due to these practices.

The Master Logger Program has been in place for several years to train loggers how to plan their logging activities and to install Best management Practices that lessen the impact of logging activities. Recently, laws and regulations were enacted which

established the expected BMPs to be used and allows the Commissioners of the Departments of Environment and Conservation and of Agriculture to stop a logging operation that has failed to install these BMPs and so are impacting streams. Currently, Mill Branch is the only stream in the watershed to have documented impacts from logging operations. Large tracts of land in the upper portion of the Caney Fork River Watershed remain forested, so the potential for future impacts may be high and need to be carefully monitored.

Since the Dust Bowl era, the agriculture community has strived to protect the soil from wind and soil erosion. Agencies such as the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service, and the Tennessee Department of Agriculture have worked to identify better ways of farming, to educate the farmers, and to install the methods that address the sources of some of the impacts due to agriculture. Cost sharing is available for many of these measures. Of special concern in the Caney Fork River Watershed is the expanding nursery industry around Smithville.

Many sediment problems traceable to agricultural practices also involve riparian loss due to close row cropping or pasture clearing for grazing. Agriculturally impacted streams which could benefit from the establishment of riparian buffer zones include Bee Creek, Rock Spring Branch, Hickory Valley Branch, Smith Fork, Bates Branch, Saint Mary's Branch, Bradden Creek, and Post Oak Creek.

6.3.B.ii. Pathogen Contamination.

Possible sources of pathogens are inadequate or failing septic tank systems, overflows or breaks in public sewer collection systems, poorly disinfected discharges from sewage treatment plants, and fecal matter in streams and storm drains due to pets, livestock and wildlife. Permits issued by the Division of Water Pollution Control regulate discharges from point sources and require adequate control for these sources. Individual homes are required to have subsurface, on-site treatment (i.e., septic tank and field lines) if public sewers are not available. Septic tank and field lines are regulated by the Division of Ground Water Protection within Cookeville Environmental Assistance Center and delegated county health departments. In addition to discharges to surface waters, businesses may employ either subsurface or surface disposal of wastewater. The Division of Water Pollution Control regulates surface disposal.

Currently, only three stream systems in the Caney Fork River Watershed are known to have excessive pathogen contamination. These are Fall Creek (Smithville), Pigeon Roost Creek (Cookeville), and Mine Lick Creek (Baxter). All three are centered around urban areas, with varying contributions of bacterial contamination coming from stormwater runoff, failing septic systems, sewage collection system leaks, and treatment plant operation leaks.

Other measures that may be necessary to control pathogens are:

Voluntary activities

- Limiting livestock access to streams, including use of off-channel watering of livestock (see previous examples).
- Proper management of animal waste from feeding operations.

- Better maintenance of subsurface disposal systems.

Enforcement strategies

- Greater enforcement of regulations governing on-site wastewater treatment.
- Timely and appropriate enforcement for non-complying sewage treatment plants, large and small, and their collection systems.
- Identification of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations not currently permitted, and enforcement of current regulations.

Additional strategies

- Restrict development in areas where sewer is not available and treatment by subsurface disposal is not an option due to poor soils, floodplains, or high water tables. This is particularly important in the Caney Fork River Watershed, given the geology of the Cumberland Plateau and Escarpment.
- Develop and enforce leash laws and controls on pet fecal material in areas with higher population densities.
- More efforts by local urban public works and utilities to identify and control contaminated stormwater runoff sources entering storm sewer systems.

6.3.B.iii. Excessive Nutrients and/or Dissolved Oxygen Depletion.

These two impacts are usually listed together because high nutrients often contribute to low dissolved oxygen within a stream. Since nutrients often have the same source as pathogens, the measures previously listed can also address many of these problems. Elevated nutrient loadings are also often associated with urban runoff from impervious surfaces, from fertilized lawns and croplands, and faulty sewage disposal processes.

Other sources of nutrients can be addressed by:

Voluntary activities

- Educate homeowners and lawn care companies in the proper application of fertilizers.
- Encourage landowners, developers, and builders to leave stream buffer zones (examples of streams that could benefit are Wolf Creek and Ferguson Branch). Streamside vegetation can filter out many nutrients and other pollutants before they reach the stream. These riparian buffers are also vital along livestock pastures. Beaverdam Creek, Bradden Creek, and Smith Fork could benefit from buffer zones to grazing areas.
- Use grassed drainage ways that can remove fertilizer before it enters streams.
- Use native plants for landscaping since they don't require as much fertilizer and water.

Physical changes to streams can prevent them from providing enough oxygen to biodegrade the materials that are naturally present. A few additional actions can address this problem:

- Maintain shade over a stream. Cooler water can hold more oxygen and retard the growth of algae. As a general rule, all stream channels suffer from some

canopy removal. An intact riparian zone also acts as a buffer to filter out nutrient loads before they enter the water.

- Discourage impoundments. Ponds and lakes do not aerate water. Fall Creek (below Smithville) has suffered from an impoundment. *Note: Permits may be required for any work on a stream, including impoundments.*

Regulatory strategies.

- Greater enforcement of regulations governing on-site wastewater treatment.
- More stringent permit limits for nutrients discharged from sewage treatment plants (including Hickman Creek, Falling water River, Pigeon Roost Creek, and Fall Creek).
- Timely and appropriate enforcement for noncomplying sewage treatment plants, large and small, and their collection system.
- Identification of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations not currently permitted, and enforcement of current regulations.

6.3.B.iv. Toxins and Other Materials.

Although some toxic substances are discharged directly into waters of the state from a point source, much of these materials are washed in during rainfalls from an upland location, or via improper waste disposal that contaminates groundwater. In the Caney Fork River Watershed, a relatively small number of streams are damaged by stormwater runoff from industrial facilities or urban areas. More stringent inspection and regulation of permitted industrial facilities, and local stormwater quality initiatives and regulations, could help reduce the amount of contaminated runoff reaching state waters. Examples of streams that could benefit from these measures include the many small, urbanized tributaries feeding Pigeon Roost Creek, Falling Water River, Hickman Creek and Mine Lick Creek.

Many materials enter our streams due to apathy, or lack of civility or knowledge by the public. Litter in roadside ditches, garbage bags tossed over bridge railings, paint brushes washed off over storm drains, and oil drained into ditches are all examples of pollution in streams. Some can be addressed by:

Voluntary activities

- Providing public education.
- Painting warnings on storm drains that connect to a stream.
- Sponsoring community clean-up days.
- Landscaping of public areas.
- Encouraging public surveillance of their streams and reporting of dumping activities to their local authorities.

Needing regulation

- Prohibition of illicit discharges to storm drains.
- Litter laws and strong enforcement at the local level.

6.3.B.v. Habitat Alteration.

The alteration of the habitat within a stream can have severe consequences. Whether it is the removal of the vegetation providing a root system network for holding soil particles together, the release of sediment, which increases the bed load and covers benthic life and fish eggs, the removal of gravel bars (like in the Rocky River), cleaning out creeks with heavy equipment, or the impounding of the water in ponds and lakes, many alterations impair the use of the stream for designated uses. Habitat alteration also includes the draining or filling of wetlands.

Measures that can help address this problem are:

Voluntary activities

- Organizing stream cleanups removing trash, limbs and debris before they cause blockage.
- Avoiding use of heavy equipment to clean out streams (Hickman and Indian Creek have suffered from such activities).
- Planting vegetation along streams to stabilize banks and provide habitat (nearly all streams could benefit from this).
- Encouraging developers to avoid extensive culverts in streams.

Current regulations

- Restrict modification of streams by such means as culverting, lining, or impounding. Streams such as Fall Creek (in Fall Creek Falls State Park) and Fall Creek near Smithville are two examples of the impact impoundments can have, especially in the iron-rich soils of the Cumberland Plateau.
- Require mitigation for impacts to streams and wetlands when modifications are allowed. As an example, Center Hill Dam, like most large dams, has chronically caused serious impacts to the Caney Fork River in the downstream tailwater from low oxygen levels and unnatural thermal and flow alterations.

Additional Enforcement

- Increased enforcement may be needed when violations of current regulations occur.

6.3.B.v. Acid Mine Runoff.

The Cumberland Plateau has had a long history of coal mining, much of which was done prior to any type of environmental regulation. Unfortunately, the legacy of many of these old mining sites is severe impacts to the streams that drain them in the form of pollution from metals and low pH from sulfuric acid.

Streams that would benefit from remediation projects include the portions of the Rocky River, Gardner Creek, Piney Creek, Dry Fork Creek, Clifty Creek, Milsea Branch, and Puncheon camp Creek.